



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/982,070	10/17/2001	Joerg Jahnke	30014200-1009	7274

26263 7590 01/09/2006

SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP  
P.O. BOX 061080  
WACKER DRIVE STATION, SEARS TOWER  
CHICAGO, IL 60606-1080

EXAMINER

TANG, KENNETH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2195

DATE MAILED: 01/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/982,070

Applicant(s)

JAHNKE, JOERG

Examiner

Kenneth Tang

Art Unit

2195

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 October 2005.  
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-64 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-64 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the Response on 10/3/05. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but were not found to be persuasive.
2. Claims 1-64 are presented for examination.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 1-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Bowman-Amuah (US 6,842,906 B1) in view of Baker et al. (hereinafter Baker) (US 6,611,498 B1).**

4. As to claim 1, Bowman-Amuah teaches a computer-implemented method in a data processing system for providing resources adapted to at least one of a plurality of user environments (dictionary pattern environment, etc.) (*col. 4, lines 55-58, col. 38, lines 60-67 through col. 39, lines 1-10*), the method comprising the steps of:

initiating execution (operation) of a program, the program having a session object and a resource identifier that is associated with a plurality of resource data stored in the session object (*col. 283, lines 48-64*); and while the program is executing, determining from the session object

Art Unit: 2195

which of the plurality of user environments the program is executing in (done by the unique identity of identifier) (*col. 283, lines 48-67, col. 284, lines 1-10*); and

5. Bowman-Amuah teaches identifying which of the resource data is suitable for the determined user environment because the identifier identifies what is suitable. Bowman-Amuah fails to explicitly teach that the determination of the user environment is done by both the resource identifier and the determined user environment. However, Baker teaches a data processing system that adapts to a plurality of user environments based on environment variables, identifiers, languages (such as English, French, etc.), and by geographical location (*col. 3, lines 33-37, col. 14, lines 42-53, col. 16, lines 25-42*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the feature of the determination of the user environment is done by both the resource identifier and the determined user environment to Bowman-Amuah's data processing system, using identifiers addresses and objects to determine various types of services because this would extend the capabilities to an international level with people of many different languages (*col. 3, lines 33-37*).

6. As to claim 2, Bowman-Amuah teaches wherein the determined user environment identifies a location of a user of the program (location of the global addresses) (see Abstract). Baker also teaches identifying by a geographical location (*col. 3, lines 33-37, col. 14, lines 42-53, col. 16, lines 25-42*).

7. As to claim 3, Baker teaches wherein the determined user environment identifies a language (such as English, French, etc.) of a user of the program (*col. 3, lines 33-37, col. 14, lines 42-53, col. 16, lines 25-42*).

8. As to claim 4, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 1. In addition, the broadest reasonable interpretation of the received resource data is satisfied in Bowman-Amuah by its object (*col. 283, lines 48-67, col. 284, lines 1-10*) or in Baker's environment variables (*col. 3, lines 33-37, col. 14, lines 42-53, col. 16, lines 25-42*).

9. As to claim 5, Bowman-Amuah teaches wherein the step of identifying which of the resource data is suitable comprises: loading a lookup object for linking the resource identifier with the resource data suitable for the determined user environment; and obtaining the suitable resource data from the lookup object by using the resource identifier and the determined user environment (*col. 192, lines 13-28*).

10. As to claim 6, Bowman-Amuah teaches wherein a number of users are using the data processing system; and wherein at least one lookup object is loaded for each user (*col. 140, lines 49-67 through col. 141, lines 1-12*).

11. As to claim 7, Bowman-Amuah teaches wherein a number of users are using the data processing system; and wherein at least one lookup object is loaded for a plurality of users (*col. 140, lines 49-67 through col. 141, lines 1-12*).

12. As to claim 8, Bowman-Amuah teaches wherein the resource data comprises: step of obtaining the suitable generating a string identifier comprising the resource identifier and the user environment; and obtaining the suitable resource data using the generated string identifier, wherein the lookup object includes a link between the string identifier and the suitable resource data (*col. 283, lines 65-67 through col. 284, lines 1-10 and lines 48-55*).

13. As to claim 9, Bowman-Amuah teaches wherein the step of obtaining the suitable resource data comprises: invoking a dictionary function to obtain one of a plurality of lookup objects corresponding to the determined user environment and that link the resource identifier with the suitable resource data (*dictionary, Fig. 58, 62, or 63*).

14. As to claim 10, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 1.

15. As to claims 11-19, they are rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claims 1-9.

16. As to claim 20, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 1.

17. As to claim 21, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 1. In addition, it is inherent that the data processing computer system contains a processing unit (CPU) and memory.

18. As to claim 22, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 4.
19. As to claim 23, Bowman-Amuah teaches wherein the resource data comprise a string of at least one character (*col. 283, lines 65-67 through col. 284, lines 1-10 and lines 48-55*).
20. As to claim 24, Bowman-Amuah teaches wherein the resource data comprise a resource function including rules for character representation (*col. 283, lines 65-67 through col. 284, lines 1-10 and lines 48-55*).
21. As to claim 25, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 2.
22. As to claim 26, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 3.
23. As to claim 27, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 5.
24. As to claim 28, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 1. It is inherent that there are components (parts) that perform the limitations of claim 1.
25. As to claim 29, Bowman-Amuah teaches wherein the lookup component generates a string identifier comprising the resource identifier and the user environment, and generates the

Art Unit: 2195

suitable resource data using the generated string identifier (*col. 283, lines 65-67 through col. 284, lines 1-10 and lines 48-55*).

26. As to claim 30, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 9.

27. As to claim 31, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 1.

28. As to claim 32, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 21. In addition, Bowman-Amuah teaches the first storage area and plurality of second storage areas (*Fig. 10, 1000, 1020, etc.*).

29. As to claims 33-41, they are rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claims 1-9.

30. As to claim 42, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 1.

31. As to claims 43-51, they are rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claims 1-9.

32. As to claim 52, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 1.



Art Unit: 2195

33. As to claims 53-62, they are rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claims 21-30.

34. As to claim 63, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 1.

35. As to claim 64, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 21.

#### *Response to Arguments*

36. During patent examination, the pending claims must be “given their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification.” *In re Hyatt*, 211 F.3d 1367, 1372, 54 USPQ2d 1664, 1667 (Fed. Cir. 2000). Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution, and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. *In re Prater*, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-51 (CCPA 1969).

37. *Applicant argues on page 16 of the Remarks that the objects in Bowman-Amuah are not the same as the objects in the claimed invention because the objects in Bowman-Amuah relate to business and not sessions.*

In response, Bowman-Amuah’s objects relate to business sessions (*col. 102, lines 32-43, etc.*). Nowhere in the Applicant’s specification does it state that the system cannot relate to business. The broadest reasonable interpretation of the claimed language is satisfied. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show

Art Unit: 2195

nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Baker also teaches session objects (*col. 5, line 62 and col. 8, lines 24-26, etc.*).

38. *Applicant argues on pages 16-17 that Bowman-Amuah's object identifier is unlike Applicant's claimed object identifier because it doesn't relate to information about a determined user environment.*

Bowman-Amuah teaches that objects represent elements of the computer-user environment and therefore, the user environment is identified and determined by its respective objects (*col. 11, lines 65-67*).

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2195

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenneth Tang whose telephone number is (571) 272-3772. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM - 6:00PM, Every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kt  
12/27/05

  
MENG-AI AN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER